

001  
**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**FEB 06 2004**

**OFFICIAL**

**LAW OFFICES OF**  
**McGINN & GIBB, PLLC**  
A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817  
TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100  
FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376  
E-MAIL: MCGINNGIBB @ AOL.COM

SEAN M. MCGINN  
PHILLIP E. MILLER†  
FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDER†  
PETER A. BALNAVE, Ph.D.  
FREDRIC J. ZIMMERMANT  
JAMES E. HOWARD†  
JAMES N. DRESSER  
JOHN J. DRESCH  
†MEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA

ANNAPOLIS, MD OFFICE  
FREDERICK W. GIBB, III  
MOHAMMAD S. RAHMANT

February 6, 2004

**VIA FACSIMILE**  
**(Total No. of Pages Transmitted: 3)**

To: Examiner Jason D. Cardone  
Group Art Unit No.2142  
U.S.P.T.O.

Facsimile No.: (703) 872-9306

From: Frederick E. Cooperrider

Facsimile No.: (703) 761-2375 or 76

Re: Enclosed Response to Restriction Requirement  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/506,603  
Attorney Docket No. YOR919990374US1  
Our Reference: YOR.134

Dear Examiner Cardone:

Enclosed is a Response to Restriction Requirement responsive to the Office Action mailed on January 8, 2004, which we request that you enter and which should place the above-referenced case in condition for allowance.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration on this case.

Very truly yours,



Frederick E. Cooperrider  
Registration No. 36,769

FEC/jkm  
Enclosure

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
FEB 06 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Boivie, et al.

Serial No.: 09/506,603

Group Art Unit: 2142

Filed: February 18, 2000

Examiner: Cardone, J.

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ENFORCING COMMUNICATIONS BANDWIDTH  
BASED SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS TO PLURALITY OF CUSTOMERS  
HOSTED ON A CLUSTERED WEB SERVER

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated January 8, 2004, please consider the following:

**REMARKS**

In response to the Examiner's restriction requirement, Applicant hereby elects the invention of Group I directed to claims 1-6 and 8-26, with the following comments.

First, it is questionable whether the plain meaning of the claim language is correctly reflected in the Examiner's description of invention I and invention II. Second, it is questionable whether it could be reasonably asserted that an undue burden is imposed on the Examiner when a complete search has already allegedly been done, as evidenced by the Office Action dated July 29, 2003.

Early, favorable prosecution on the merits is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner find the Application to be other than in condition for allowance, the